## DECISION ON APPLICANT REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Under section 60851 of title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, if the Bureau of State Audits or the Applicant Review Panel decides to exclude or remove an applicant from the pool of applicants being considered for selection to the Citizens Redistricting Commission, the applicant may, no later than 10 days after the date of the notification of exclusion or removal, request reconsideration of the decision if the decision was the result of an error relating to:

- Having a conflict of interest;
- Failing to satisfy the eligibility requirements for serving on the commission; or
- Failing to comply with the procedural requirements of the application process.

Name of the Applicant/Requestor: Thomas A. Myers
Date of the notice of exclusion or removal: April 19, 2010 .
Date the request for reconsideration was received: April 19, 2010 .
Description of the alleged error that caused the exclusion or removal: <u>Applicant incorrectly</u> stated in Part 3 of the supplemental application that his brother, with whom he has a bona fide relationship, has engaged in an activity within the past ten years that causes Applicant to have a conflict of interest that makes him ineligible to serve as a member of the Citizens Redistricting Commission. Specifically, he incorrectly stated that his brother contributed \$2,000 or more during a calendar year to a candidate for local elective public office.
Request for reconsideration is: Granted
Reason for granting or denying the request: Applicant explained on the application and in his request for reconsideration that although his brother tried to contribute \$5,000 to a candidate for Los Angeles County supervisor in 2008, this contribution exceeded the county contribution limits, and therefore the candidate did not accept the full amount of the contribution. The candidate returned all of the contribution except for \$1,000. This was confirmed by a review of the candidate's campaign disclosure forms. Accordingly, Applicant's brother did not actually contribute \$2,000 or more to a candidate for local elective public office as erroneously stated on the application. It therefore appears that Applicant should not be excluded from the applicant pool.
Applicant's current status: <u>Included in the supplemental applicant pool.</u>
Name and title of person making decision: <u>Steven Benito Russo</u> , <u>Senior Staff Counsel</u>
Date of decision: April 21, 2010